



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_13535
Title of the Manuscript:	Improving Education Opportunity, Health, and Quality of Life of Orphans and Vulnerable Children: The Sustainable Action against HIV and AIDS in Communities (SAHACOM)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Include • More detailed description of ethical consideration that is specific to the study • Clearer description of how exactly participants were recruited • How exactly quality of life was measured • Objectives of the study • Use HIV and AIDS rather than HIV/AIDS	Thank you very much for your important constructive comments. We have accepted all of your advices and revised the manuscript accordingly. All revised parts in the text are highlighted in yellow as suggested by the journal. • We have revised the description of ethical consideration as suggested by the reviewer. Because the OVC were under the age of 18, we have have heightened the roles of their caregiver or guardian in making decision to participate in the study and provide informed consent before the interview. Please see L174-181, p6. • As suggested, the recruitment process has been revised proving more detailed description on how the OVC were selected after health centers were chosen in each selected province using probability proportional to size sampling. Please see L119-122, p5. • Self-rated quality of life was measured using the following question, "In general, how would you rate your overall quality of life?" with five response options including very good, good, neither good nor poor, poor, and very poor. Similarly, self-rated overall health status was measured using the following question, "In general, how would you rate your overall



SDI Review Form 1.6

		health?” with five response options including very good, good, neither good nor poor, poor, and very poor. Please see L164-168, p6. - As suggested, the objectives of the study have been revised as follows: ‘The specific objectives of the study were to assess the changes of key outcome indicators including education opportunity, food security, and general health and quality of life among OVC from baseline to end line and to document lessons learned and challenges experienced during five years of the project life.’ Please see L79-82, p4. - The ‘HIV and AIDS’ in the title and on L44, p2 was used because it was part of the official name of the SAHACOM project. However, throughout the manuscript, the ‘HIV/AIDS’ has been used consistently.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Include • More information on the intervention, with detailed description • Rationale for the study • Results organised according to objectives	• The information on the intervention has been revised adding further description on specific activities that had been implemented in communities for improvement education opportunity, health, and quality of life of the OVC. Please see L41-51, p2. • We have revised rationale of the study as suggested. Please L72-77, p4. • Results have already been organized according to the objectives which included looking at the changes in socio-economic situations of the OVC and family, support received, support perceived to be the most important for the OVC and family, food security, and overall health and quality of life.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Not clear as the ethical considerations described are general rather than specific to the study	This concern has been addressed as suggested. Please see L174-181, p6.